

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 10, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are now all the claims pending in the present application. Claim 5 has been withdrawn. Claim 6 has been canceled.

I. Specification

Applicant has amended the specification as indicated above for purposes of consistency.

II. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 6 for being of improper dependent form. Claim 6 has been canceled, consequently, the objection to claim 6 is now moot.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Meguro (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,598). As indicated above, claim 6 has been canceled from the application.

The Examiner has not provided grounds for rejecting claims 2 and 3. Since the Examiner has not provided grounds for rejecting claims 2 and 3, claims 2 and 3 should be deemed allowable. In the event the Examiner rejects claims 2 and 3 in a subsequent Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests that any subsequent Office Action be on a non-final basis since

claims 2 and 3 were not previously rejected. MPEP 707.07(i) “In every Office action, each pending claim should be mentioned by number, and its treatment or status given.”

Claim 1 recites “wherein each of said liners has an outer circumferential portion that is not fixed on the inner surface of said casing.” The Examiner asserts that Meguro Fig. 9, col. 4, lines 4-36 discloses that application points are located inside the outer periphery of the liners, thus leaving an outer circumferential portion that is not fixed to the inner surface of the casing.

However, Applicant’s submit that the hatched area deposit points 53 as shown in Fig. 9 are clearly located on an outer circumferential portion with respect to the liner 51. This would be apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art and as further clarified by claims 2 and 3. Further, as evidenced by Figs. 7, 8 and 10 of Meguro, Meguro desires that an outer circumferential portion of slippery films 51 and 52 be bonded to upper and lower sections 31 and 32. See also col. 5, lines 30-35.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

IV. New Claims

Applicant has added claims 7-9 to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claims 7-9 are readable on the elected species. Claims 7-9 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency on claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No.: 10/618,703


Attorney Docket No.: Q76521

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 18, 2005